UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2443rd MEETING: 25 MAY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2443)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);	
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2443rd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 25 May 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. M. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2443)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
   Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ramlogun (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2439th to 2442nd meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Hadj Azzout (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Joseph (Australia), Mr. Hashim (Bangladesh), Mr. Adjibade (Benin), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Trucco (Chile), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Blain (Gambia), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Traore (Mali), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Cabrera (Panama), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Stevens (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bassole (Upper Volta), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela), Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma

(Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Barbados, Cyprus, Gabon, Liberia, Mexico, Mongolia, the Niger, Qatar and Viet Nam in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Davin (Gabon), Mrs. Jones (Liberia), Mr. Marin Bosch (Mexico), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Jamal (Qatar) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took places at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 25 May from the representative of Jordan [*S/15790*], which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration by the Council of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia', in accordance with rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

7. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of ZAIRE.

9. I should like, first of all, to tell Mrs. Kirkpatrick, the representative of the United States, how much we appreciate the competent way in which she directed the work of the Council during the month of April.

10. I welcome the presence among us of numerous Ministers for Foreign Affairs, who have come from Africa and elsewhere to participate in the Council's debate on the situation in Namibia and to emphasize the concern which the dangerous continuation both of the illegal occupation of Namibia and of the denial of the basic rights of the people of Namibia by South Africa causes to their Governments, with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security, in this sensitive part of Africa, which we hope will not become a pawn in the rivalries of the great Powers.

11. Finally, I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General, not only for the clarity, lucidity and courage of his further report on the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) of the Security Council concerning the question of Namibia [*S/15776*], but also for his tireless efforts with a view to Namibia's rapid accession to independence. In our opinion, the Secretary-General is and remains a symbol of the aspirations and hopes of the international community, in general, and of the countries of the third world, in particular, for more justice, equity, freedom and equality in relations among nations and peoples. The high degree of conscientiousness and seriousness with which he discharges his responsibilities and which we perceive from the accuracy of his analyses of situations compel our respect and our admiration.

12. We pay a particular tribute to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the valiant people of Namibia, for its political maturity, its spirit of sacrifice and abnegation and the assurance with which it has always tackled the question of a negotiated settlement for the independence of Namibia, placing its trust in the United Nations and in the commitment undertaken by the entire international community through the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

13. We also extend our congratulations to the United Nations Council for Namibia, the legal Administering Authority for the Territory, for the remarkable work it has done to free the Namibian people from the racist and shameful yoke of an obdurate colonialism and to lead the country to an independence in which its territorial integrity is respected and its much-coveted natural resources are safeguarded.

14. The question of Namibia has preoccupied the international community for more than half a century, because it was in 1915, during the First World War, that the Territory, which at that time had been under German administration since 1884, was entirely occupied by South Africa forces.

15. After the First World War, under the aegis of the League of Nations, South Africa's administration of the Territory, as everyone knows, was no longer consistent with the provisions of the Mandate: instead of developing the administration of the Territory according to the principle whereby the well-being and development of the Namibian people were to constitute a sacred trust of civilization, and whereby it was necessary to increase by all means the material and moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants of the Territory while promoting their progressive development towards self-government or independence, South Africa enacted discriminatory laws and regulations, the obvious purpose of which was to annex the Territory. It put down the justified revolts by means of violent repression and established separate reservations where the Africans were supposed to reside,

set up a Legislative Assembly in which only whites were allowed to sit and showed every sign of reluctance to fulfil its obligation to report regularly on how the Territory was being administered.

16. Since that time, the constant and unequivocal position of the Namibian people, which determines today and will continue to determine tomorrow the way we treat this matter in Zaire, is summed up admirably in the following extract from a statement made by a leader in the liberation movement of Namibia who was captured by the South Africans:

> "We are Namibians and not South Africans. We do not admit today nor will we ever admit that you have the right to govern us, to impose upon us laws in which we have no say, to treat our country as if it belonged to you, and to treat us as if you were our masters. We have always considered South Africa an interloper in our country."

17. When the history of Namibia is written and posterity weighs or judges our acts, it is devoutly to be hoped that the present debate in the Council will not be interpreted as one more demonstration, in a long series, of a mission betrayed.

18. South Africa, at the time of the League of Nations, administered the Territory of South West Africa but violated the Mandate's provisions. That was the first betrayal of a mission, in terms of the League of Nations Mandate.

19. When the United Nations came into being in 1945, South Africa deliberately and overtly did everything it could to defeat the fundamental purposes of the trusteeship system that are clearly set forth in Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, South Africa's racist effrontery led it to request, in 1946, that the Territory be incorporated into South Africa.

20. That was the second example of the betrayal of a mission by a State Member of the United Nations under the complaisant gaze of those who had the power to ensure respect for the provisions of the Charter relating, through decolonization, to the maintenance of international peace and security.

21. On 14 December 1960, the General Assembly adopted resolution 1514 (XV), containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. By the unanimous adoption of that Declaration, the entire world community undertook to lead to independence and sovereignty all those Territories which had formerly been colonized, for the limits of the colonization process had been reached, its consequences, as far as international peace and security and the harmony of relations between nations and peoples were concerned, having become irreconcilable and incompatible with the primary purposes and objectives of the United Nations, with the requirements of peace and with the efforts to establish trustful co-operation between nations and peoples.

22. That Declaration, which was the embodiment of our firm resolve to recover our freedom, also confirmed the justness and corroborated the legitimacy of our struggle, including that waged by SWAPO in Namibia, for independence. And if today we are able to act as sovereign nations and sit in the Security Council to debate world affairs—which are also our affairs—we wonder why the same should not be true of Namibia. The Declaration had the merit of replacing a colonial scenario in international relations by one of decolonization, something with which, whether we like it or not, we have to live in this last quarter of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first. For 23 years now, therefore, the consequences of the adoption of that Declaration have not yet had any effect so far as the Territory of Namibia is concerned.

23. That was the third mission betrayed, in terms of the Declaration which, 23 years ago, proclaimed the need to put an end, unconditionally and swiftly, to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and called for immediate steps to transfer all powers to the peoples in those Territories which were not yet independent. But that Declaration is the legal framework within which the United Nations seeks to speed up progress towards the freedom and independence of peoples.

24. On 27 October 1966, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. Today, 17 years later, South Africa continues illegally to occupy Namibia. What is more, in his statement in the Council yesterday [*2440th meeting*], the representative of South Africa went so far as to assert that his country was still legally administering Namibia in accordance with the League of Nations Mandate, since no binding judgement to the contrary had revoked that Mandate.

25. For a fourth time, then, a mission was betrayed, in terms of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which was subsequently endorsed by the Security Council.

26. In 1978, five Members of the United Nations—not just any members, but five influential Members, which, in addition, happen to be the main partners of South Africa, to which they are linked by economic, trade, military and cultural relations of some magnitude—took the noble, praiseworthy and courageous initiative of drawing up a plan designed to ensure the swift liberation of Namibia within a year. They carried out an information campaign that finally mobilized the entire international community in favour of that plan. At the time, the plan was considered to be the only possible basis for a negotiated and swift settlement of the Namibian question. The world endorsed it and then the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 435 (1978) approving a plan for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question. We must agree that hopes were running high at that time.

27. But five years after the adoption of that resolution and the world-wide endorsement of the plan, the situa-

tion obtaining in Namibia is worse than it was at the breakdown of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January 1981, and even as early as the time when SWAPO was recognized by the United Nations as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia; the settlement plan itself seems once again to have been called into question by some as regards its being the only possible basis for reaching a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia. At the same time, other problems not foreseen in the settlement plan have arisen for the first time.

28. The question which occurs to us is the following: Was that plan for settling the Namibian problem really intended to speed up the independence of Namibia as we thought, or was it designed rather to blunt the vigilance of the Namibians, of Africa and of all right-thinking peoples throughout the world, if not to hoodwink them?

29. And if, as we continue to believe, that plan was intended to accelerate the independence of Namibia, how can we avoid the unfortunate impression, based on the continuation of the present situation, that it might well have been dreamt up for other reasons, since it is perfectly obvious that those who promoted it were unable to ensure, to this very day, that it would be acceptable to South Africa?

30. Can a single nation, one that was itself outlawed by the international community, one that lives outside the law, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the internationally recognized norms of behaviour that govern civilized societies the world over, one that practises a State policy that is universally condemned as a crime against humanity—can such a nation really thwart the States of the world united against *apartheid* and drawing their strength from the principles of law and democracy? We wonder what makes South Africa and its friends behave as they do in Namibia, bearing in mind—as we must—that it was that same South Africa that was able to go along with the Lancaster House Agreements on the evacuation of Zimbabwe?

31. These are questions that arise out of the stalemate on the Namibian question and that require an answer.

32. The situation prevailing in Namibia, a situation characterized by South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of the Territory, in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions; by the denial of the fundamental rights of the Namibian people; by South Africa's repeated acts of aggression carried out from the Territory against such neighbouring African States as Angola—a part of whose territory is today still occupied by South African troops—Mozambique, Lesotho, Zambia and others I need not mention; by the endangering of trusting and harmonious relations among nations, peoples and ethnic groups in the world; and by the refusal to co-operate with the United Nations in general and with the Council in particular in the implementation of the United Nations plan—that situation represents a real danger to international peace and security.

33. If we do not wish to betray for a fourth time the obligations we have assumed towards the Namibian people under resolution 435 (1978) we must put further efforts into drawing up a precise time-table for the implementation of that resolution in order to speed up the advent of Namibia's independence.

34. Quite apart from the legal aspect of the problem, which means that nations must co-operate in implementing resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978), resolution 435 (1978) entails a moral responsibility for the five countries that conceived it, bore it to the baptismal font and acted as its godparents. It is thus the duty of those countries to redouble their efforts to bring about the success of that plan in a reasonable period of time, while the Secretary-General, because of the direct responsibility assumed by the United Nations, should be requested to report on the developments in this matter before the next session of the General Assembly.

35. If the range of measures that the Council can still take to ensure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) is diminishing, if the margin for action of the Council is narrowing with each passing day, that is not the fault of SWAPO, which has always shown great flexibility and political maturity; nor is it the fault of Africa, the front-line countries or the non-aligned countries. It is quite simply the fault of South Africa, which continues obdurately to refuse to co-operate with the Council in the implementation of the plan, consequently forcing the Council to resort to the extreme measures provided for in the Charter, all non-coercive measures and persuasion having been exhausted. Is that what the Pretoria régime wants, or does it know already that the extreme measures laid down in the Charter will never be taken in its case?

36. Does South Africa want peace or does it want confrontation? How can it seek confrontation and, at the same time, prevent this affair from assuming extra-African dimensions in this troubled world, in which the internal imbalance of such a sensitive region cannot help but affect world balance?

37. Is there anyone who believes that a situation of neither peace nor war in southern Africa can be considered an option in order to guarantee the interests of the white minority and consolidate its position in that region?

38. Are there still people who believe that peace in that region would not help to protect the legitimate interests of the minorities that have arrogated to themselves a position of strength in defiance of the most elementary rules of law and democracy?

39. If, on the other hand, it is true that South Africa wants peace, how can it turn a deaf ear to the voice of reason and to the appeals of the whole of the international community, which has proposed a peaceful and negotiated settlement in order to achieve a just, lasting and honourable solution to the problem?

40. Once again, these are questions that arise out of the stalemate on the Namibian question and that require an answer.

41. In Africa, and particularly in Zaire, we want the problem of Namibia, which is in essence a colonial problem, to be settled free from the influence of the East-West confrontation, and we are opposed to the introduction into the question of Namibia of alien elements that might alter its fundamental nature.

42. Resolution 435 (1978) must therefore be implemented without either modifications or constraints, and must be applied practically and with the realism the situation demands.

43. That is why we fully share the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations when he says in his report:

> "It is evident that the delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) is having a destructive impact not only in Namibia itself but also on the prospect of a peaceful and prosperous future for the region as a whole. The delay also has an adverse effect on international relations in a wider sphere, adding to the prevailing sense of frustration and mistrust, with all that that implies for peace and security in the region.
>
> " . . .
>
> "Progress has been made in securing a large measure of agreement on the modalities to be employed in implementing resolution 435 (1978). In fact, as far as the United Nations is concerned, the only outstanding issues are the choice of the electoral system and the settlement of some final problems relating to UNTAG and its composition. The views of the South African Government on these problems are still awaited.
>
> "Unfortunately, moreover, the positive side of the balance sheet has been set back by the emergence of other issues which were neither raised nor envisaged at the time when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted or in the subsequent negotiations under United Nations auspices. These issues now apparently constitute the main reason for the delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan." [*S/15776, paras. 16, 18 and 19.*]

44. We also share the conclusion reached by the Secretary-General when he says:

> "I am deeply concerned that factors which lie outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) should [today] hamper the implementation of that resolution.
>
> "The effects of delay are being felt profoundly not only by the people of Namibia, for whose welfare the United Nations has a special obligation, but also by other States of the region. . . . I believe that the settlement of the Namibian question is of overriding importance for the future peace and prosperity of the entire region." [*Ibid., paras. 19 and 20.*]

45. We are firmly in favour of peace and against confrontation in Africa generally and, in particular, in southern Africa. The effects of the tragic series of events in the Middle East, which make us fear that a conflagration might flare up at any time, are sufficiently alive in our memories for us not to attempt to add to such sources of tension in the world, particularly in the horn of Africa.

46. Thus, while we are very pleased at the encouraging developments that have occurred, which have been inspired by the desire for peace in the region, and while we are gratified at the political maturity and flexibility demonstrated by SWAPO and the front-line States, we deplore and condemn the fact that South Africa has not been able to make even the slightest gesture that could be regarded by the international community as likely to build confidence in the region.

47. The main partners of South Africa and the members of the contact group, with which we have various ties of friendship and co-operation, must realize the need not to encourage South Africa to pursue this course.

48. Let me take this opportunity to pay a particular tribute to France for its very clear and outspoken attitude on certain problems which might very well handicap and hold up efforts to reach a negotiated solution that would be both just and lasting.

49. While Zaire once again condemns the repeated acts of aggression committed by South Africa against independent African States in the region, particularly the occupation of the sovereign territory of Angola, a brother country with which we have numerous ties forged by history, geography, language, blood and culture, and also condemns the recent raid against Mozambique, we have, at the same time, every faith in the ability of the African people to face up to the problems before them if they are allowed to work on them in peace and freedom. We must respect the sovereign right of every State and every people to settle its problems as it sees fit, free from any interference and without endangering the interests of other States.

50. We in Africa and in Zaire consider ourselves reasonable people who understand many things. But there are occasions in history when we have to step back and take a look at our specific interests in order to respond to the appeals of other human beings, particularly in a world which believes in human rights and fundamental freedoms and for which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a sacred book. This is what we expect of the main partners of South Africa and expecially from the five member countries of the contact group.

51. Has the time not come to put an end, by the appropriate means, to the long series of betrayals of the obligations arising from the contract on decolonization with Namibia—or are we to continue to stand by, powerless, and yield to the pressures and manoeuvres designed to destroy this decolonization contract concluded between the United Nations and the people of Namibia? That is the crux of what is being discussed by the Council today; that is the question to which a reply will have to be

found, because what is at stake is the credibility of the Council and the entire work of the United Nations, which bears direct responsibility for leading Namibia to independence.

52. When the epic struggle of the United Nations for the restitution of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of those in Namibia is recorded for posterity, it is to be hoped that the conclusions of the present discussion in the Council will be regarded as a courageous a the culmination of a long and grievous human tragedy, as the final, transcendent deed which will inscribe in golden letters the contribution of the Council to the independence of the Namibian people—the penultimate chapter of a marvellous epic, crowned by the celebration of Namibia's independence. This is what is expected of the Council by millions of men and women in Africa whose eyes are even now turned towards the glass palace in Manhattan.

53. In this context, Zaire will associate itself with any positive and effective actions which might hasten Namibia's accession to independence and dispel the unfortunate impression that the whole history of Namibia has been that of a mission betrayed.

54. For that reason we should like to remind everyone, particularly our partners, the members of the contact group, that together we have signed a decolonization contract with the Namibian people, and that contracts are carried out in good faith. We have to be realistic and take into account the fact that decolonization is the major political and cultural feature of international relations in this second half of the twentieth century. It is the reality of decolonization that today makes necessary all the readjustments which have to be made in the present world order.

55. I should not like to conclude my remarks without reiterating our complete solidarity with SWAPO, whose heroic liberation struggle we salute. The United Nations having recognized SWAPO as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, we cannot permit the Namibians, under the banner of SWAPO, to be treated as outcasts in their own country.

56. I voice the hope that the Council, in the name of the United Nations, will completely dissociate itself from the actions of South Africa and take vigorous and effective steps to expedite the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia.

57. Our most heartfelt wish is that the conclusions reached by the present debate in the Council will mark a new and decisive stage in the already over-long process of Namibia's accession to independence.

58. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Security Council.

59. The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique, Mr. Joaquim Alberto Chissano, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

60. Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique): Today the Organization of African Unity (OAU) is commemorating its twentieth anniversary. It has been 20 years of struggle for the self-determination and independence of the African peoples. In the course of that period we have been patient, but determined and militant in the search for solutions conducive to the total emancipation of our continent. Guided by the spirit and letter of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, the African peoples have succeeded in uniting their efforts and leading an effective struggle against foreign domination.

61. Some of us experienced colonialism and oppression for more than five centuries. Hence, independence, freedom and peace are so dear that we accept all sacrifices so that colonialism and *apartheid* may be eradicated from our continent. Our weapons are unity, the determination to be free and the strength of our purpose. For this reason we enjoy the full support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations.

62. We greet you, Mr. President, with special happiness, since you are from an African country, a member of the OAU and of the United Nations. Your people, like the people of Namibia, experienced colonial humiliation and repression. We are convinced that, under your leadership, the Council will find the ways and means that will lead to the independence of Namibia.

63. When I left Maputo I brought with me a specific mandate to support firmly the legitimate demand of the people of Namibia that Council resolution 435 (1978) be implemented so that their freedom and independence might be recovered.

64. I came with the determination to support the call by the international community to restore to the Council and to the Secretary-General the vital role to which they are entitled in the solution of the problem of Namibia, a role which in a subtle manner has been usurped by certain countries that intend to transform into their exclusive monopoly the right which is shared equally by all Members of the United Nations to contribute significantly to the search for a negotiated and just solution of the problem of Namibia.

65. I did not come here to speak of the traditional destabilizing role of South Africa in southern Africa. My Government thought that the dialogue we reluctantly agreed to initiate with the inhuman régime of South Africa constituted a healthy, desirable and acceptable way, encouraged by the international community, to activate the norms of peaceful coexistence and mutual respect between our countries, in the interest of international peace and security.

66. I did not come here to remind the members of the Council of the horrendous acts of aggression and the massacres perpetrated by the racist régime in Nyazonia, Mapai and Chicualacuala in Mozambique. I did not come here to remind them of the horrors of the attack against Matola in January 1981 or of the acts of aggres-

sion and attack against Ponta do Ouro, where the corpses of the Boers who were killed constituted undeniable proof of the criminal action of the Pretoria régime. I did not come here with the intention of speaking of the recruitment, training, arms and logistical support given by South Africa to the hordes of armed bandits that kidnap, violate and assassinate the wives of the peasants in my country; mutilate the elderly and the children; burn crops and destroy hospitals; burn and loot trains, trucks and stores; mine and sabotage roads, bridges and railroads; and kidnap and torture nationals of Western and socialist countries serving in Mozambique. I did not come here to speak of the arson and the destruction of the fuel depot in Beira, or the dispatch of boats into our territorial waters to carry out espionage missions.

67. I did not come here to speak of all this, because our Government thought that when, to the surprise of the entire international community, we agreed to dialogue with the South African Government we might be contributing towards creating in our region a climate of calm and peace.

68. My Government sent me to New York to speak on the question of Namibia. The diversionary tactics of the Pretoria régime will not deflect me from my mission. However, since the representative of the racist régime sought here to mislead international public opinion and the opinion of the Council, I thought it appropriate to introduce a parenthetical note before elaborating on the issue which brings me here and which is on the agenda of the Council in order to provide information in a few words on the escalation of tension in southern Africa and the South African aggression against my country.

69. The representative of the racist régime, using hypocritical and aggressive language, tried to present his country as the one most interested in peace and stability in the region. His allegations—gratuitous, devoid of any sense and deliberately orchestrated to deceive representatives present here and international public opinion—do not hold up against the slightest attempt at scrutiny.

70. The representative of the Pretoria régime, in addressing the Council [*2440th meeting*] wanted it to believe that Schoeman, being a common criminal, could never be a South African agent whose mission was to assassinate leaders of Mozambique, carry out reconnaissance of key strategic points in my country and commit acts of destruction and sabotage for South Africa.

71. Who, if not a criminal who has been in and out of prisons since the age of 14, would have been the person most qualified to carry out this most sordid mission if he had been promised his freedom in return?

72. Does the representative of Pretoria want to convince the Council and world public opinion that South Africa uses angels and saints to perpetrate acts of aggression against the front-line States?

73. South Africa has constantly tried to deny its responsibility in the creation, financing and utilization of the armed bands let loose against my country.

74. It has been confirmed beyond any doubt that Orlando Cristina, a Portuguese national and one of the prominent leaders of the armed bands, was killed on his farm near Pretoria. Could it be that South Africa, with all its police and intelligence apparatus, did not know of the existence and the role of this man in disrupting the peace in the region?

75. A press release, dated 30 October 1981, issued by the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations, said that the armed bandit, Adriano Bomba, who stole an air-force plane from my country, was receiving training as a pilot of Impala jet war-planes, the same type of aircraft that strafed Matola in the morning of the twenty-third of this month.

76. Can South Africa deny that Adriano Bomba, the present leader of the armed bandits who, under the command and with the support of the Pretoria régime, sow death and destruction, was not trained by Pretoria for this sordid mission?

77. Is this how the Pretoria régime promotes peaceful coexistence, of which it is so proud, with the countries of the region? On the other hand, the arrogant agent of *apartheid* will never be able to quote one case in which my country has trained bandits, infiltrated spies, violated the territory or airspace of South Africa or concentrated massive contingents of forces along the common border. Mozambique has never sent one single soldier, one weapon or even one gram of explosive to South Africa. Those who fight in South Africa are the South African people.

78. As the Council is already aware, a heavily armed formation of the South African Air Force, comprising from 14 to 16 aircraft, violated the territory of my country and, at 7.20 a.m., dropped its lethal cargo on civilian targets and the peaceful inhabitants of Matola, an industrial and residential area a little less than 20 kilometres from Maputo, the capital of Mozambique.

79. The result of this action, motivated by hatred and carried out at a time when the workers were leaving their homes to go to their jobs, was the death of six civilians—among them a woman in the final months of pregnancy, two children aged two and five years, one South African citizen and two workers of the SOMOPAL fruit-juice processing plant—40 civilians wounded, 14 houses damaged and a kindergarten destroyed.

80. The indiscriminate crimes of the racist leaders of South Africa were not directed against elements of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), as the Pretoria authorities claim. The 14 houses destroyed, as has been confirmed, are not ANC bases of any sort but simply houses of civilians who fortunately were not hit by the genocidal bombs simply because they had left for their places of work. The fruit-juice processing plant, the kindergarten and the people who were the victims in these two places provide overwhelming evidence that those places were not training centres or the headquarters of ANC which would have to be strongly protected and shielded with anti-aircraft missiles.

81. It was the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Mozambique that were violated once again.

82. It was the people of Mozambique that were attacked and massacred.

83. The tactic of using indiscriminate violence against neighbouring countries under the pretext of harassing and destroying ANC bases is a device which South Africa resorts to in order to divert the attention of the international community from the grave conflict that is spreading within its own borders. What it wants is to conceal the nationalist nature of the armed struggle being carried out by the people of South Africa by alleging that the régime is the victim of an armed conspiracy by neighbouring countries.

84. However, ANC has been in existence for over 70 years now. Its creation in 1912 therefore predates the creation of the FRELIMO [*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*] party. The armed struggle of the South African people began in 1961, many years before we launched our own armed struggle, which ended with the overthrow of the Portuguese colonialists in 1974. Moreover, the South African people resorted to armed struggle only when the racist authorities of Pretoria refused dialogue and banned ANC.

85. When our country became independent in June 1975, the struggle of the people of South Africa had already reached a high level of development and sophistication. The international press was already publishing reports of ANC attacks on and the destruction of strategic targets in the interior of South Africa.

86. Nelson Mandela was condemned to life imprisonment by the racist authorities because they said that he was responsible for the national liberation struggle.

87. Mandela did not come from Mozambique; perhaps the authorities in Pretoria wanted the Council to believe that Mandela was sent by the Portuguese colonial régime to attack South Africa.

88. The massacres at Sharpeville, Soweto, Gogolito and Langa clearly demonstrate the fact that the minority and racist régime which holds power in South Africa is at war with the majority of the South African people.

89. That régime's final goal, pursued through intimidation, terror, aggression and destruction, is the surrender of the countries of the region to the hegemonic design of South Africa and their passive acceptance of the practices of racial segregation prevailing in the heartland of *apartheid*.

90. In view of all this, we cannot accept the proposition that the aggressive violence of South Africa against my country and the liberation activities carried out by ANC inside South Africa are in any way parallel or comparable or to be condemned without distinction. To do this would be deliberately to camouflage the truth.

91. South Africa invaded and committed barbarous aggression against a sovereign State.

92. The action carried out by ANC last Friday in South Africa was an internal matter in which the armed forces of our country were not involved. Trying to blame a neighbouring and independent country and retaliating against it because of an internal action that was the result of a criminal, segregationist, racist national policy condemned and vehemently opposed by the people of the country and by the international community constitute intolerable, arbitrary and gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State.

93. The statement by the representative of the *apartheid* régime was notable for its total disrespect for the Council and its apocalyptic threats against the States of the region. South Africa came to the Council looking for confrontation. It is therefore a confrontation between South Africa and the international community as represented in the Council. Pretoria does not recognize any validity in the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Council, including those that terminated Pretoria's Mandate over the Territory of Namibia.

94. On the other hand, we came to the Council guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We are for peace, and we intend to work for its preservation. South Africa knows this. The members of the Council know it. Only this year my President hosted a dinner—known as "the dinner of peace"—for the ambassadors representing the permanent members of the Security Council accredited to Maputo, and there our stand was made clear and applauded. Our central concern was to search for means of establishing a climate of peace in our region.

95. At our last meeting with the South African Government we talked about our policies in the search for avenues leading to peaceful coexistence. We hope to continue this effort. However, we also said, and we continue to say, that, while we love peace, we do not fear war. If it is necessary to fight a war in order to preserve peace in our region, we shall do so once again.

96. My country has been at war for over 20 years now. We fought a war against Portuguese colonialism to free our people from colonial domination and exploitation. We fought the war to create peace in our country.

97. It was the ideal of freedom and the struggle for peace that led us to accept sacrifices so that the flag of freedom, equality and harmony among men could fly in Zimbabwe. Thousands of Mozambican citizens were murdered by the illegal régime of Smith, supported by South Africa. Tens of thousands of children became orphans. Thousands of women mourned. Economic and social infrastructures were razed. But those criminal acts did not prevent the fall of the illegal racist régime of Southern Rhodesia. Today, in Zimbabwe, children, women and men are all citizens of a free and sovereign nation, respected and recognized by the entire international community.

98. Our party has just held its fourth congress. It reiterated the policy of peace of our State, which will resort to force only in cases of legitimate self-defence. The actions and acts of aggression by South Africa will not make us back down, because we are not just 12 million Mozambicans; with us are the 23 million black South Africans and the millions of coloured, Indian and white South Africans who oppose *apartheid* and desire freedom and peace for our region; with us are all the front-line States constantly threatened by *apartheid*; with us is the international community; because our strength lies in the reason and the justness of our cause. For this reason we are not afraid of the South African threat.

99. The fact that the international community reacted with indignation to the recent attack perpetrated by the South African Air Force against my country is in itself significant and encouraging. Governmental and non-governmental institutions in all continents condemned the *apartheid* régime and expressed their solidarity with our people and Government. We thank all those who unequivocally denounced and condemned this criminal act of aggression. We reiterate here before the representatives of the international community our unshakable support for the people of South Africa in their just struggle for the elimination of *apartheid*. We are certain that in this struggle the people of South Africa and the international community will be victorious and *apartheid* destroyed.

100. Allow me now to speak on the subject-matter that has brought us to these meetings.

101. In 1969, three years after the end of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*], the Council adopted its resolution 264 (1969), which, *inter alia*, considered that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia was illegal and contrary to the principles of the Charter and the previous decisions of the United Nations and was detrimental to the interests of the population of the Territory and those of the international community. By virtue of paragraph 3, the Council called upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory.

102. The demand for immediate withdrawal was reiterated more firmly in Council resolution 269 (1969), which in paragraph 5 called upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw its administration from Namibia before 4 October 1969—in other words, withdraw immediately.

103. Fourteen years have elapsed since then—14 years of systematic violation of the decisions of the Council, rendering this body a discredited and ineffective forum.

104. The Council assumed responsibility for the Territory of Namibia, with the understanding that the problem of Namibia was an issue that constituted a threat to international peace and security. Today, more than ever, it is evident that the situation prevailing in South Africa is indeed grave and explosive and prone to explode into a conflict of unpredictable proportions and repercussions. With each day that passes, tension increases, the number of deaths increases, the materials of war increase and the field of tension is extended.

105. In 1969, it was the independence of Namibia that was at stake. Today, it is Angolan territory that is occupied, it is Mozambique that is the object of aggression; it is Zimbabwe that is the target of constant infiltration; it is Zambia that is constantly threatened; it is Lesotho that is bombed and asphyxiated; it is far-away Seychelles that is the target of mercenary attacks. All these actions are carried out by the Nazi, Fascist régime of Pretoria.

106. It is South Africa that violates the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our countries. It is South Africa that endangers the peace, security and development of our region, which could have serious consequences considering the explosiveness of the current international atmosphere.

107. This is the régime that arrogantly and shamelessly violates the decisions of the international community and refuses to comply with the decisions of this body, which has been mandated by the Charter of the United Nations to be the guarantor of international peace and security.

108. What is at stake is not only the dignity of the humiliated people of Namibia, whose right to self-determination and independence has been denied, but also the dignity of each one of us present today as representatives of sovereign peoples who fought for their political emancipation. What is at stake here is the reputation, the dignity and the prestige of the Council as the trustee of Namibia.

109. The Council, in its resolution 264 (1969), recognized in a clear and unequivocal manner, in paragraph 1, that the General Assembly had terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and had assumed direct responsibility for the Territory until its independence. Since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa in 1966, we have witnessed systematic violations of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by the *apartheid* régime. The Council has countless times been called upon to consider the critical situation prevailing in Namibia. In all cases, this body has demanded the withdrawal of South Africa's forces and administration, which are illegally occupying the international Territory of Namibia.

110. The obstinate refusal of the racist régime of Pretoria has been possible only because it enjoys the blessing and support of certain permanent members of the Council. The co-operation of such countries with the hated racist régime extends to the military and nuclear domains, thus making them accomplices in the crime of *apartheid* and, materially and morally, accomplices in the continuing occupation of Namibia, the systematic massacring of the civilian population, the repeated acts of aggression and destabilization directed against our coun-

tries and the acts of economic sabotage that undermine our development efforts.

111. All peoples that cherish peace and freedom, and the international community as a whole, saw in resolution 435 (1978) the instrument which, since it represented a universal consensus, would finally lead to the self-determination and independence of Namibia. SWAPO, the African States and the non-aligned countries mobilized all their efforts with a view to ensuring the implementation of that resolution. To that end, we worked with certain Western countries that maintain close relations with South Africa. We did so in good faith, in a spirit of openness and the desire for dialogue in order to solve a crucial problem that affected the entire international community.

112. Resolution 435 (1978) was the result of a common effort by all of us. After its adoption, we developed joint efforts to bring about its immediate implementation. However, five years have already elapsed and we have, to our frustration, achieved minimal progress.

113. In the course of all those years, SWAPO, demonstrating political maturity and common sense and in a constructive and exemplary manner, has made concessions that have gone even beyond acceptable limits. Now, when the open and constructive debates in the General Assembly and within the Council show unequivocally and unquestionably that all arguments plead for the independence of Namibia, and all manoeuvres to delay the independence of that Territory have been exhausted, we are being confronted with new demands that are totally out of context and inconsequent and only serve to complicate and imperil the process of negotiations.

114. When everything seemed to have been discussed and agreed upon, South Africa and the United States brought the question of the presence of Cuban forces in Angola to the negotiating table, arrogantly establishing an unfounded and illogical link between the presence of those forces in Angola, a sovereign State, and the independence of Namibia, an international Territory illegally occupied by South Africa.

115. Abusing the confidence placed in them, some members of the contact group now claim that this is not a question of linkage but rather a demand by the South African régime which we should accept in the name of realism and in order to advance the process of negotiations.

116. This paternalistic argument, typical of régimes that only recognize the supremacy of force as the basis of international relations, is a clear demonstration that for some permanent members of the Council the question of Namibia has ceased to be a question of the liberation of the peoples of Namibia; it has ceased to be a question of illegal occupation by South Africa. For these Powers the question of Namibia has become a pretext for attempts to recover their lost economic and strategic hegemony in southern Africa following the liberation of the peoples of that region.

117. The realism that is now being urged upon us as necessary by certain members of the contact group means that Angola should, against its will and against the most legitimate interests of its people, accede to South African demands if we want to see the process of Namibian independence moving forward.

118. From whatever angle the question of the presence of Cuban internationalist forces may be considered, if we continue to consider it a determinant in the process of independence for Namibia we shall be establishing a dangerous precedent that violates the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, we shall be embarking upon a labyrinthine process which, far from enabling us to find a solution to the Namibian problem, will serve only to legitimize and institutionalize the arrogance and intransigence of the Pretoria régime in its defiance of the international community and the most elementary rules of the co-existence of nations.

119. The Council must resolutely and unequivocally refuse to link the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola. When we adopted resolution 435 (1978) Cuban troops were already in Angola. At that time, none of the permanent members or any Member of the United Nations established any linkage between these two realities, because we were all aware of the reason for the presence of such forces in Angola.

120. Angola is a sovereign country, a Member of the Organization, upon which the Charter bestows the sovereign right to appeal to any and every State in defence of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

121. Thus, to make the independence of Namibia dependent on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola would constitute more than mere interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State; it would be an express act of complicity with South Africa, which persists in occupying Namibia illegally.

122. We are certain that the Council will know how to say "No" to this manoeuvre. Just as the international community paid tribute to the United States when in the Second World War its forces crossed the Atlantic and contributed to smashing the aggression of Hitler's Nazi régime, we cannot but greet today the Republic of Cuba, which has selflessly offered the blood of its best sons to halt the advance of the Fascist South African forces of occupation that were but a few kilometres from Luanda. One might compare the talk about the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola with a demand for the return of American troops to Washington at the time when Hitler was decimating the European populations. When one speaks of withdrawal, it is the South African troops which should withdraw from Angola. It is they who are sowing death and destruction in Angola.

123. It is important for us to abandon the persistent position of passivity and retreat in the face of Pretoria's arrogance. The administration of Namibia does not

belong to South Africa: it is the responsibility of the United Nations. We should shoulder this responsibility if we want to restore the reputation of the United Nations, and particularly of the Security Council.

124. In order to guarantee the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the Council should take effective measures to define the system for the election of a constituent assembly and to establish the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) force.

125. It is important that a clear time-table be established for the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978). The Council should provide the Secretary-General with all the necessary powers so that, once and for all, the delaying manoeuvres aimed at postponing the independence of Namibia to a distant tomorrow are brought to an end.

126. Mozambique congratulates the Secretary-General on the courage, objectivity and clarity of his report [*S/15776*]. In expressing his concern about the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the Secretary-General let it be known in his report that a future of peace and prosperity throughout our region was profoundly compromised with serious repercussions for international relations.

127. In concluding his report, the Secretary-General pleads with us for justice and peace to be established in Namibia and throughout the southern zone of our continent. In this context, we hope that the Council will take appropriate measures to terminate the illegal occupation of Namibia, so that a free and independent Namibia may emerge. That is our demand, as representatives of peoples guided by the ideals of freedom, justice, peace and progress. It is not enough for the Council to limit itself to condemning the illegal occupation and denouncing the massacres perpetrated against the people of Namibia.

128. The people and Government of Mozambique will continue to support SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia. We endorse the struggle of the Namibian people because we know the meaning and the price of the struggle for freedom and independence, justice and progress. In supporting the liberation struggle of SWAPO, we do so fully convinced that we are widening the frontiers of peace and freedom, which the peoples of the world cherish so much. As the Council is the main guarantor of international peace and security, we expect the decisions to be taken at these meetings in order to end the occupation of Namibia and Angola, to bring independence to Namibia and the end of the aggression against and destabilization of the front-line States perpetrated by South Africa, so that a climate of freedom and justice may prevail throughout our region.

129. To sum up, Mozambique calls for the establishment of a definite date for a cease-fire; the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978); the speedy establishment of a time-table for the election of a Constituent Assembly; the immediate establishment of the UNTAG force; a clear and unequivocal statement by the Council invalidating and opposing any linkage or any pretext that might otherwise impede the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); and for the Secretary-General to carry out the mandates of the General Assembly and the Council and submit a report to the Council as early as possible before the next session of the General Assembly.

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

131. Mr. KIRÇA (Turkey): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May. My delegation is particularly happy to see this important debate on the question of Namibia taking place under the distinguished presidency of an African member of the Council and we are confident that under your guidance this debate will have a successful conclusion.

132. My delegation also derives satisfaction from the fact that the Council has taken up consideration of the situation regarding Namibia at this particular moment. As previous speakers have pointed out, the process of bringing independence to Namibia is passing through a crucial stage. All the elements are present in this critical stage to move events in either of two directions: either towards the implementation without further delay of the independence plan for Namibia, approved in Council resolution 435 (1978), or towards a further aggravation of the political situation and the troubles in and around Namibia.

133. The Council is seized of this burning international question at this particular moment because of the simple fact that the Namibian problem is the responsibility of the United Nations in more ways than one. Nearly 20 years have passed since the General Assembly terminated the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia and established the United Nations Council for Namibia, with direct responsibility for the administration of that Territory [*resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967*]. Twelve years have passed since the International Court of Justice pronounced on the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia. Five years have passed since a tenable plan for the independence of Namibia was adopted by the Council with the concurrence of all the parties, including South Africa. That resolution, 435 (1978), forms the indisputable basis and framework for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem; therefore it is only appropriate that at this time the Council should evaluate this situation.

134. In Namibia we are confronted with one of the last but most important vestiges of colonialism: illegal occupation and social repression. This situation has aroused the strong indignation of all the Members of the United Nations. We see that everyone is united on which is the party preventing the settlement of this question. There is also unanimous agreement, as I have just mentioned, on

the steps which should be taken to resolve this question. Such agreement on a solution is also rare. The time when this plan for independence should have been implemented has passed. Paradoxically, it is still difficult to say that the struggle for the achievement of freedom and independence for Namibia is about to end.

135. We believe that when the Council decides on how to proceed at this point the existing situation in Namibia and the plight of the Namibian people should be taken into consideration above anything else. Their suffering, the denial of their basic rights and freedoms under the deplorable *apartheid* policies and the exploitation of their natural resources have continued for too long.

136. Confronted with such a prolonged and intolerable foreign occupation, the Namibian people are engaged in a rightful struggle for national independence under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole authentic representative. On the other hand, the efforts carried out by the contact group, particularly during the past year, have produced an agreement which, we believe, will facilitate the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) in a short time.

137. It can justifiably be said that the successful conclusion of these negotiations was largely due to the conciliatory attitude shown by SWAPO and the front-line States. Their flexible attitude was undoubtedly motivated by the concern they felt about the consequences of the continuation of the sufferings of the Namibian people. The African States and SWAPO were able to maintain their conciliatory attitude despite the evasive tactics of South Africa.

138. South Africa's attitude during the recent history of Namibia has been characterized by the dual policy that it appears to follow. This dual policy consists in displaying an interest in a negotiated settlement on the one hand and obstructing progress on the other. We saw this happen in 1981 during the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva, as well as during the most recent efforts by the Western contact group. Today, as this debate continues, we witness measures being taken by South Africa which are detrimental to the process of peace and to the process of the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

139. South Africa must be made to see the wrongness of its position and that it cannot continue totally to disregard world opinion and the dynamic developments and progress taking place in Africa. It must realize that the strands of colonialism to which it is still clinging belong to an era long past.

140. In the light of recent experience, it has become evident that only decisive sanctions as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations will produce the necessary effect. For only through the settlement of the Namibian problem by the attainment of full independence by Namibians can progress be made in the re-establishment of general stability in southern Africa. And only with the emergence of a united, sovereign and independent Namibia can the prolonged suffering and sacrifices of the Namibian people come to an end.

141. We believe that it is the responsibility of the international community to exert every effort to ensure the achievement of this goal in the shortest possible time. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April, demonstrated the solidarity of the international community and its determination to find an urgent solution to the problem of Namibia. We are confident that this body will consider ways and means to set in motion—final motion—the process of independence for Namibia. In this respect, we should like to commend the Secretary-General for his valuable and untiring efforts to bring about the full implementation without delay of the United Nations plan. As a result of the detailed preparations undertaken, the United Nations is ready to go ahead with carrying out the plan for the independence of Namibia. We hope that the necessary conditions will prevail to enable the Secretary-General to continue effectively his efforts in this direction.

142. My Government, for its part, is fully committed to the efforts being exerted by the United Nations to ensure the full sovereign independence and absolute territorial integrity of Namibia and the unity of the Namibian people. My Government has faith in the just cause of the people of Namibia and in the final victory of the national independence struggle of the Namibian people.

143. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Guinea. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

144. Mr. KABA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset, Sir, on behalf of the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea, I wish to express our great pleasure at seeing you preside over the work of the Council for the month of May. Please accept the warm congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of this important position. My pleasure is increased by the fact that I am among those who hold you in the highest possible esteem for your great experience and skill as a diplomat. My delegation is convinced that, under your inspired leadership, the work of the Council cannot fail to proceed in a spirit of equity and responsibility. I salute you as a great statesman from a country with which my own has the closest ties of friendship and fraternity.

145. I should also like to congratulate, through you, your predecessor, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, the representative of the United States, on the skilful way in which she guided the work of the Council last month.

146. At this crucial stage in the history of Namibia there is a need for a practical contribution to the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people in the fight that they are waging on our African soil at the very time when, as if to defy us, the Fascists of Pretoria are launching their tanks and their mercenaries, from the martyred country of Namibia itself, against the rear bases of SWAPO in the front-line countries.

147. The most recent murderous raids carried out by the mercenary forces of South Africa against independent, sovereign Mozambique on 23 May provide a sinister illustration of South Africa's brazen persistence in spurning the constant appeals to reason from the international community.

148. Thus, this serious situation is spreading to all southern Africa, becoming more complex, explosive and threatening; the underlying purpose, undoubtedly, is to intimidate, and thus to win concessions for the multinationals and the racists.

149. As if this were not already enough, the racist Government of South Africa instructed its representative once again to thumb its nose at the international community, including its protectors, by declaring at the outset of his statement, with his customary cynicism:

> "The time has come to remind the United Nations that South Africa has never accepted the United Nations view that South Africa's presence in the Territory is illegal." [*2440th meeting, para. 71.*]

150. The African peoples for their part are quite prepared to meet this challenge so that all Africa can live free and independent.

151. We should like to remind those who still entertain any doubts on this score that there is no precedent in history of aggressors being able to overwhelm peoples that were motivated by a firm resolve to defend their independence. That is particularly true in this century, when world reaction is being rapidly overtaken by the forces of progress.

152. We believe that it is important to have a clear grasp of the Namibian situation since any undue pessimism would simply favour the sinister designs of the imperialists and their racist lackeys.

153. Indeed, in October 1966 and May 1967 the General Assembly, at the request of African and Asian countries, adopted resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 and 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, in which it decided that Namibia came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. At the time, it envisaged the immediate granting of independence to Namibia and entrusted to the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the interim, the functions of legal Administering Authority of the Territory until it became independent.

154. Unfortunately, since that date to the present, in a series of events that included the regrettable pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January 1981, the Pretoria clique, supported by its protectors, has obstinately refused to implement both General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, while putting forward unacceptable proposals of its own.

155. In the light of those successive failures, the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March, and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April, invited the Council to meet at the earliest possible date to consider further action on the implementation of the plan for Namibia's independence. In their decision, taken at the New Delhi Conference, the Heads of State or Government again called upon the Council to assume its primary responsibility for implementation of resolution 435 (1978) [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49*].

156. My delegation would like to place a great deal of hope in the present series of Council meetings. We should not like to despair of the international community's ability to deal justly with a people, the Namibian people, which did not ask to be handed over to South Africa. It was the League of Nations which, by a simple vote, decided the fate of that fraternal people. Who bears responsibility for this situation if not the United Nations, which succeeded the League of Nations?

157. Peace-loving and justice-loving peoples throughout the world, particularly the peoples of Africa, are listening with confidence and hope in their hearts that this time the international community—and in particular, the representatives of the great Powers, the great democracies, staunch upholders of human rights and humanism when that serves their interests—will, at the end of these debates, ensure a triumph for the right of peoples to self-determination and full control of their destinies. Thus, we must do what we can to build a free, independent and democratic Namibia.

158. The numerous resolutions that have been adopted, the numerous plans for a peaceful settlement that have already been drawn up, the innumerable talks that have been started, the long and difficult meetings that have been held in addition to the present series, demonstrate that the time for hesitation and mere verbal condemnations is past. The question of Namibia has plagued us all for too long. For 35 years now, Africa's patience has been put to the test. We believe it is now time to act, and to act swiftly and with determination. The very least that can be demanded, as we see it, is the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions, which must include a strengthening of the embargo on all forms of trade with South Africa.

159. Today, as in the past, the racist Government of Pretoria, together with its allies, continues to evince bad faith, arrogance and treachery, to stymie any negotiations on the question of Namibia and to defy the international community with complete impunity.

160. Guinea regards the new demands put forward by Pretoria and its protectors as a pure delaying tactic, on the thin pretext of some threat to the security of South African frontiers posed by the presence of Cuban troops in the free and sovereign land of Angola.

161. My delegation not only reaffirms its total adhesion to the Paris Declaration on Namibia,[1] adopted by the

International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People, but also endorses the forthright condemnation of any attempt to establish any link whatsoever between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous issue—in this particular case, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. My country believes that to be an underhand way of hampering the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) as well as an act of brazen interference by South Africa and its protectors in the domestic affairs of Angola.

162. In sum, may I say that, in the light of South Africa's refusal to enter into any genuine dialogue with the United Nations and SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and in the face of that defiance, my delegation proposes: first, the imposition of comprehensive sanctions, as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter; and, secondly, stepped-up assistance to Namibian refugees and to the front-line States, victims of South Africa's repeated acts of aggression, in order to strengthen their defence capabilities.

163. Convinced as we are that justice and democracy will inevitably triumph in an independent Namibia, I should like once again to proclaim the active solidarity of the people of Guinea, its state party, its revolution and particularly its leader, President Ahmed Sékou Touré, the Supreme Leader of the Revolution, to the militant people of Namibia and its vanguard, SWAPO, the sole representative of the heroic Namibian people.

164. On this solemn occasion, we should like respectfully to welcome the presence in this hall of the foremost freedom fighter of the Namibian people, our brother Sam Nujoma, to whom the progressive forces of the world have paid a tribute by sending to New York their Ministers for Foreign Affairs and eminent representatives to participate in these important debates in the Council on the question of Namibia.

165. One of the cardinal principles of the state party of Guinea is its emphatic expression of the Guinean peoples' active solidarity with all the forces throughout the world that are struggling against injustice, imperialism and colonialism. It was in the name of that principle that President Ahmed Sékou Touré, in his message to the International Conference in Solidarity with the Front-line States, held at Lisbon from 25 to 27 March 1983, expressing his complete confidence in the struggle of the southern African freedom fighters, stated:

> "Victory is on our side. In the struggle between oppressors and the oppressed, there are reasons on the side of the oppressed that ensure and guarantee them victory—their certainty that they are waging a just war, their conviction that that is the only way the class enemy has left open to them and the certainty that the people will triumph, for history has always granted victory in such cases to those upholding just causes. That they also see public opinion on their side is another propitious factor."

166. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I have already had the opportunity during this month to express my Government's and my personal congratulations to your Government, Sir, concerning Zaire's assumption of the presidency of the Council and our confidence in the fairness and skill of Zaire's representative in the conduct of those affairs. May I simply reiterate, not only our Government's general confidence in Zaire's ability and will to conduct the affairs of the Council with skill and fairness, but also our pleasure at seeing you, our former colleague, and now Minister for Foreign Affairs of your country, so experienced in the affairs of the Council and of the United Nations, occupying the post of President during these most important deliberations.

167. The events of this past week end in Pretoria and Maputo are a bloody reminder, if any was needed, of the consequences of violence and of the very real potential that today exists throughout southern Africa for the further escalation of violence. As is all too often the case, the victims of these most recent tragic events include many who were entirely innocent and blameless. The United States deplores such acts of violence, from whatever quarters, whether perpetrated in the name of change or in opposition to it. Violence cannot solve the pressing problems of the region. On the contrary, by creating new victims, new grievances and new grounds for anger and hatred, such acts can only increase the danger of new and greater violence in an ever-escalating tragic cycle. Ultimately, we must count among the wounded of these acts all those who seek and hope for peaceful change through negotiation and dialogue.

168. My Government has for the past several years been seeking to assist the Governments of the region to find peaceful ways to address and to resolve mutual problems. We have been encouraged by the purposeful high-level dialogue between Mozambique and South Africa, a dialogue which the events of last week-end must not be permitted to place in jeopardy. We have made known both to South Africa and Mozambique—and indeed to all Governments of the region—our willingness to help. We have stressed our conviction that the problem of cross-border violence, if allowed to go unresolved, will seriously endanger prospects for both stability and peaceful change.

169. Le it be clearly understood that the United States deplores violent cross-border activities in southern Africa, in whatever direction and for whatever stated goal. Similarly, we categorically reaffirm the principle that all States have a duty to refrain from tolerating or acquiescing in organized activities within their territory by guerrillas or dissidents planning acts of violence in the territory of another State. There can be no double standard for southern Africa. Cross-border violence cannot be condoned, whether it be in the form of a bomb placed in a crowded square in Pretoria by externally based organizations or of the continuing violation of Angola's territorial integrity by South African forces.

170. The Council also bears a solemn responsibility to uphold the principles of non-violence and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Those principles are especially pertinent to the issue which this meeting of the Council has been convened to consider.

171. The United States welcomes the opportunity afforded by this meeting to participate in a review of the efforts that are being made to bring about the independence of Namibia, in accordance with decisions previously taken by the Council. As all are aware, the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, bears a special responsibility for furthering the interests of the people of Namibia and their aspirations for peace, justice and independence. It has been two years since the Council last met to examine the question of Namibia, and it is therefore appropriate that it should wish to review what has transpired in the intervening period.

172. The participation in this debate of so many distinguished ministers for foreign affairs testifies to the importance and the urgency which the international community as a whole attaches to the attainment by the people of Namibia of their justly deserved and too-long-delayed independence. I especially welcome the presence here of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the front-line States, with which Governments of the contact group have enjoyed an active, constructive and vital partnership in our efforts to hasten Namibia's independence.

173. Finally, I welcome this opportunity to report to you on the role that my Government, in partnership with the other members of the contact group, has sought to play in helping to promote a peaceful, negotiated settlement for the earliest possible attainment of Namibia's independence.

174. Before doing so, however, I wish to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General. I know at first hand his deeply felt commitment to the attainment of Namibia's independence. I have been impressed by his dedication and objectivity and have full confidence in his ability to carry out the responsibilities assigned to him under Council resolution 435 (1978). I am also aware of the efforts he and his staff have made to ensure that all is in readiness for the day when agreement is reached for implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

175. I also wish to thank the Secretary-General for his report [*S/15776*], which provides an accurate summation of what has transpired since the Council last met on this issue in April 1981. It is not necessary to recapitulate what he has already set out. I should, however, like to recall the very different circumstances that prevailed at the time of that last meeting.

176. The tone and the outcome of that debate were very much a reflection of the widespread disappointment over the failure of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva, in January 1981, to reach agreement on a date for the start of the cease-fire envisaged in resolution 435 (1978). The pre-implementation meeting ended only a few days before the Reagan Administration, of which I am a member, took office in Washington. It became one of the urgent tasks of the new American Government to assess, jointly with its contact group partners, the reasons for the failure of the Geneva meeting.

177. It would be fair to say that the new American Government was the recipient of a great deal of advice at that time. I will be frank in telling the Council that there were those who advised strongly against a continuing United States role in pursuit of a negotiated settlement of the Namibian problem. It was said by a good many that the obstacles to a peaceful settlement were too great to be overcome and that the interests of the United States in the region did not justify the tremendous commitment of time and energy that would be required. Needless to say, the persons responsible for formulating the policies of this Administration did not share those views. Although they were mindful of the great difficulties involved, they were also aware of the efforts that had already been made and of the opportunity that existed to resolve through peaceful negotiations this pressing issue. They were, in this regard, sensitive to the cardinal importance attached to Namibia's early independence by the nations of Africa. These goals more than justified a rededication to the efforts which the contact group had first undertaken four years earlier.

178. At the same time, we were anxious in our renewed approach to the problem to avoid, if at all possible, the frustrations of the past. We sought an approach that would not result in the same disappointment so keenly felt, above all by the people of Namibia, following the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting. With this firmly in mind, we undertook a fresh round of consultations, first with our contact group partners and then with the other parties concerned: the front-line States, the South African Government, SWAPO and the Namibian political parties that would also participate in the United Nations-supervised elections envisaged in resolution 435 (1978).

179. In the course of these consultations several facts became abundantly clear. First, we were assured of the interest and the desire of all those directly concerned that the negotiations should continue. Secondly, it was clear that, in the absence of a peaceful negotiated settlement leading to Namibia's independence, the situation of armed conflict and instability in the region would only worsen, with unacceptable consequences for all the inhabitants of the region. Finally, we were assured by those with the greatest stake in the success of the negotiations that the contact group had a continuing and important role to play in helping to bring about a peaceful settlement.

180. On the basis of this assessment, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the contact group met in May 1981 and decided to redouble their efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement. They reaffirmed their conviction that only a settlement under the aegis of the United Nations would find broad international acceptance and that resolution 435 (1978) continued to provide the basis

for Namibia's peaceful transition to independence. Bearing in mind the difficulties that had arisen at the pre-implementation meeting in Geneva, the contact group Ministers for Foreign Affairs further decided to develop specific proposals that would address directly the concerns that had thus far prevented the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). They considered that the purpose of these proposals should be to give all concerned greater confidence as regards the future of an independent Namibia.

181. Since the relaunching of their negotiating efforts in the spring of 1981 the members of the contact group have worked closely and intensively with all the parties concerned. It is a matter of the greatest regret to us, as I know it is to all of those here, that the promise of Namibia's independence has not yet been realized. At the same time, however, I believe it would be a mistake to discount the progress that has been achieved towards the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) since the Council last met to review the situation [*2267th to 2277th meetings*].

182. First, it is important to note that all parties concerned have reaffirmed their acceptance of resolution 435 (1978). That resolution and the settlement plan it endorsed remain the only agreed and recognized basis for an internationally acceptable settlement of the Namibia question.

183. All parties have committed themselves to constitutional principles which will serve as a guide to the elected Constituent Assembly in drafting a democratic Constitution for an independent Namibia. This agreement, which was confirmed to the Secretary-General in July of last year and which is noted in his report to the Council [*S/15776, para. 6*], has helped to reassure all those who will participate in the United Nations–supervised elections of the democratic future of an independent Namibia.

184. Substantial progress has also been made in resolving the issues which were responsible for the unsuccessful outcome of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting. In particular, through intensive consultations which took place in New York and Washington last summer, involving representatives of the front-line States, SWAPO, South Africa and the United Nations Secretariat, understandings were reached that will assure all parties to the elections of the fairness and impartiality of the process leading to Namibia's independence.

185. Finally, through their own consultations with the parties concerned, the Secretary-General and his staff have made substantial progress in resolving outstanding questions concerning the composition and deployment of the military component of UNTAG. Here I should like once again to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for the determined efforts he has made to ensure that all is in readiness for the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan.

186. Because of the substantial progress that has been made over the past two years, only two major issues remain to be resolved in preparation for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). These are: the choice of the electoral system to be employed in the elections, which all parties are agreed must be settled in accordance with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) and in a manner that does not cause delay; and final technical matters concerning the composition of the military component of UNTAG.

187. While the United States is pleased with the record of what has been achieved over the past two years, we are by no means satisfied. Indeed, none of us can rest content until the goal which we seek has been attained. But the fact that much has been achieved justifies continued commitment to the course.

188. Apart from the specific accomplishments I have just mentioned, there has been the development of an atmosphere of confidence which we hope will make it possible for the parties concerned to take the important political decisions necessary to go forward with the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We have been particularly gratified by the constructive and flexible attitude displayed by the parties concerned, which has made possible the progress that has been achieved to date.

189. We share the concern that the factors relating to the regional situation in southern Africa, which are, however, outside the scope of the mandate of the contact group, have not yet permitted implementation of the United Nations plan. We believe that these issues should be resolved rapidly, in a manner consistent with the sovereignty of all States concerned, so that the people of Namibia can exercise their right of self-determination. The Ministers have accordingly decided that the contact group should continue its work with all urgency.

190. We are convinced, now more than ever, that, with the continued good faith and co-operation of all concerned, our shared objective of a negotiated settlement leading to a stable, democratic, prosperous and independent Namibia will be realized.

191. Here I should like to say a word about the role and objectives of my Government in these negotiations.

192. I wish to stress above all that the United States neither desires nor seeks any special advantage or position for itself in these negotiations.

193. It is not our intention, nor is it within our power, to impose our own views or wishes on those whose interests and aspirations are most directly involved.

194. We fully respect the fact that the political decisions needed to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan are sovereign decisions that can only be taken by the Governments most immediately and directly concerned.

195. Furthermore, we recognize that those who must take those decisions will wish to assure themselves that

their own interests and security will be respected and protected.

196. In the sometimes thankless role that we have assumed, our sole objective has been to assist the parties in overcoming the difficulties that have to date prevented the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and the attainment of Namibia's independence.

197. Finally, I wish to assure all those here assembled that the United States will continue to work for Namibia's transition to a stable and prosperous independence once an agreement has been achieved. With other Members of the United Nations, we are prepared to contribute a fair share to ensure the effectiveness of UNTAG. We also stand ready to co-operate with others in providing the assistance that will be essential to giving all Namibians the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives.

198. I am keenly aware of the sense of frustration felt by members of this body because the aspirations of the people of Namibia have not been realized. We share that frustration; we have sympathy for the people of Namibia and the region who suffer from the continuing conflict. We will not, however, allow our feelings of frustration to lead us to despair. Our common efforts will succeed. The only alternative to continued, vigorous pursuit of a peaceful, negotiated settlement is a more dangerous and more destructive escalation of the violence that the people of Namibia and those throughout the region have known too well for too long.

199. Those of us who are privileged to participate in the decisions of this body have a special responsibility to do all that we can to help achieve Namibian independence peacefully and promptly. We are ready to work closely with other members of the Council and with the parties concerned to achieve such an outcome, which we know will also enhance the prospects for peace, security and economic development throughout the region.

200. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. José Maria Cabrera, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

201. Mr. CABRERA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In an earlier statement my delegation congratulated Mr. Umba di Lutete on his assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of May; nevertheless, Sir, I should like to express personal pleasure at seeing you preside once again over this important body; we are sure that with your experience and your usual diplomatic ability, the Council debate on the delicate question of Namibia will go forward successfully and decisively.

202. The solidarity of Panama and Latin America in general with the States which make up the OAU and with the peoples of southern Africa is based on the shared spiritual, ethnic and cultural ideals which have indissolubly linked our two continents throughout their history. We also share with the African nations the desire to maintain and promote the principles of non-alignment, independence and anti-colonialism. We are therefore committed to the struggle for the self-determination of peoples, political and economic sovereignty and the establishment of a new international economic order, which will in turn promote the progress of the countries of the third world and the establishment of more just economic relations between the industrialized countries and the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

203. Five years have passed since the Council approved, through its resolution 435 (1978), the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. Yet the Territory continues to be under the illegal occupation of a repressive racist régime, in open defiance of the common will of the international community. The acts of aggression, reprisal and destabilization directed by South Africa against the independent States of the region—most recently against Mozambique—pose a continuous threat to international peace and security.

204. In the light of the tragic plight of the Namibian people, the Council must, within the framework of its responsibility to the United Nations and the States which make up the Organization, conscientiously exert its political and moral authority to bring about action to ensure the immediate, effective implementation of the decisions of the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice and the Council itself on the independence of Namibia.

205. Besides tackling the problem of the genuine independence of Namibia, the Council should state its position on other matters of political importance, such as the full exercise by Namibia of its sovereignty over its wealth and natural resources and over all its territory, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and the other offshore islands.

206. Panama has unswervingly and incessantly condemned the vile policy of *apartheid* practised by the Government of South Africa, as well as the Pretoria régime's contemptuous disregard of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971,[2] and General Assembly and Council resolutions aimed at putting an end to the illegal occupation by South Africa of the Territory of Namibia.

207. Yesterday morning the Council heard the representative of South Africa once again challenge the Council and the United Nations, when he said:

> "I trust . . . that the Security Council will not consider any action or set any deadlines which might force southern Africa in the direction of confrontation and of an escalation of conflict. The Council should be under no illusions as to who would suffer most . . . It would be all the peoples of southern Africa, of all the countries of our region."* [*2440th meeting, para. 101.*]

208. This brutal threat is totally inadmissible and is unworthy of a modern-day State. What South Africa said

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

to the Council was that any action adopted by it with the aim of hastening the independence of Namibia would be blocked by direct confrontation and an escalation of the conflict. South Africa has warned that from its point of view the victims will be the peoples and the States of the region. Such an attitude, announced publicly by South Africa, should be rejected by all members of the international community, and deserves the harshest condemnation pronounced by the Organization against any country since the black days of the Second World War.

209. The Government of Panama, as a State Member of the United Nations and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, reaffirms its full support for sanctions against the racist régime of Pretoria for its criminal international conduct. In this connection, Panama agrees that the Council should impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa for as long as it continues its opposition to the independence of Namibia and its policy of aggression and reprisal against the front-line States and other States of the region.

210. The Council's inaction does not prevent States, acting unilaterally or collectively, from applying economic or other sanctions against the Pretoria régime.

211. Faced with the negative attitude of South Africa, it is up to the United Nations and the international community to adopt severe measures against that régime to put an end to the oppression suffered by the people of Namibia and to the aggressive actions of the Pretoria régime, which persistently commits breaches of the peace and carries out armed attacks against the neighbouring front-line countries. Such measures are all the more necessary because of the risk that the conflict could spread and attain broader proportions, thus endangering international peace and security.

212. We believe that the obstinate and defiant stand taken by South Africa against the highest principles of the United Nations and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries leaves the international community no other option than the imposition of sanctions, the implementation of which will result in the isolation of the racist régime of Pretoria. This seems to be the only way to compel South Africa to comply with its unavoidable obligation to bring about the independence of Namibia and to cease the illegal occupation of its territory.

213. In the discussions in the Council, we should not allow Namibia's independence to be made conditional upon or linked to the policy of strategic interests or national security of other States, or to the conclusion of international agreements under the doctrines of geographical proximity. The people of Panama, in connection with the Panama Canal, fought for several generations against the applicability of such strategic policies and doctrines, and are fulfilling a historical and moral duty in defending the primacy of the right of the Namibian people over South Africa's claims to control the sea route around the Cape of Good Hope as a means of access to the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic and to use this as a pretext for opposing the early independence of Namibia.

214. No interest, strategic or of any other kind, can prevail over the right to self-determination of peoples and their territorial integrity.

215. Panama therefore reaffirms its recognition of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and national independence, in a united Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative.

216. On this occasion, I should like to express our particular gratitude for the efforts of the Secretary-General to bring about the independence of Namibia. His personal interest in this question is well known, and we hope that the Council will provide him with all the necessary support.

217. Finally, I have the honour to read out a message, dated 23 May 1983, addressed to you, Sir, in your capacity as President of the Council, by the President of the Republic of Panama, Mr. Ricardo de la Espriella, which is related to this debate.

[*The speaker read out the message contained in document S/15795.*]

218. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I request the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama to transmit to the President of the Republic of Panama the thanks of the Council for the message he was kind enough to send to it. The next speaker is Mr. Syed Najmuddin Hashim, the Minister for Information of Bangladesh. I welcome him here and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

219. Mr. HASHIM (Bangladesh): Mr. President, I wish first of all to thank you and the other members of the Council for having given my delegation the opportunity to participate in this important debate, affording us the opportunity to voice the steadfast support of the Government and people of Bangladesh for the heroic struggle of the people of Namibia for freedom and independence. I should also like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this body for the month of May. We are confident that under the able and proven leadership of such a distinguished representative of a fellow non-aligned country and of such an outstanding son of Africa, the Council's deliberations will achieve fruitful and constructive results.

220. The Council, after a period of nearly two years, is meeting again to discuss the situation in Namibia, at the joint initiative of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of African States. At the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March, those leaders, who represent more than two thirds of the world community, once again unequivocally expressed themselves in favour of the immediate implementation of

Council resolution 435 (1978). The ground for a successful resolution of the problem has been laid at the recently concluded International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April.

221. We have thus travelled to join in this historic meeting in New York by way of the conferences at New Delhi and Paris. We must therefore take due note of the outcome of the two previous meetings in our present quest. At New Delhi, the Heads of State or Government called for the present meeting of the Council "in order to consider further action on the implementation of its plan for Namibia's independence thereby assuming its primary responsibility for implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)" [*see S/15675, annex, sect. I, para. 49*].

222. It is because the Non-Aligned Movement is concerned at the lack of progress in implementing that resolution, which should have led Namibia out of bondage into freedom, that it called for the United Nations to assume direct and full responsibility for every step to be taken with a view to ensuring the decolonization of Namibia. We are in agreement with the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia that the Security Council should address itself to this specific goal of bringing the talks on Namibia back into the United Nations framework.

223. Equally we are convinced by the lucid report of the untiring Secretary-General in which he says that, since the adoption of the Security Council resolution five years ago, the political situation in the region has deteriorated. He has reported "other ominous developments, including acts of destabilization, which add to the political tension in the area and impair the fragile economies of the countries of the region" [*S/15776, para. 15*]. We agree with the Secretary-General that "the settlement of the Namibian question is of overriding importance for the future peace and prosperity of the entire region" [*ibid., para. 20*], and we agree with him when he regards "the independence of Namibia as the essential and primary issue, which we must now face up to without further delay" [*ibid.*].

224. We can no longer afford to listen to Aesopian fables of alleged progress in implementation of United Nations decisions being made through efforts undertaken outside the United Nations framework.

225. Bangladesh believes that the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the principles embodied in United Nations resolutions, particularly Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We are convinced that those resolutions constitute the only viable basis for the peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence. We cannot, therefore, accept any formula outside the framework of the United Nations, and we wish to reiterate that the United Nations resolutions, particularly the Council resolutions, must be implemented in full without any modification whatsoever. We reject all attempts to link the independence of Namibia to extraneous issues. This is so fundamental a right that it cannot be predicated upon any other issue whatsoever.

226. In his statement to the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Head of the Bangladesh Government, Lieutenant-General H. M. Ershad, stated:

> "The persistent presence of colonialism and racism in southern Africa is an outrage to humanity. It continues to pose a dangerous threat to peace and security in the region. Bangladesh is irrevocably committed to the cause of the oppressed people of Namibia and South Africa. We pledge our unstinted support in their legitimate struggle for freedom, liberty and human dignity. We are fully convinced that their efforts will ultimately triumph."

227. We cannot let cruelty and injustice go unchallenged. We cannot turn a blind eye to the endless ordeals of the Namibians. The cause of peace is certainly not served by the indefensible and mounting crimes of Pretoria, the latest example of which is the South African air attack on the Mozambican capital. South Africa's usual objective in such heinous actions appears to have been achieved because reports published in *The New York Times* say that two women, a child and a factory worker were killed by aerial rockets and machine-gun fire.

228. The policies of the South African Government pose a grave challenge not only to the peace and security of Namibia but to the region, the continent and the world at large. It is equally an affront to the international community that the majority of the people of Namibia continue to suffer domination, racial discrimination and repression. The litany of South African crimes is long and unending. That a reign of terror exists has been confirmed time and again by several fact-finding missions. One such report, entitled *Namibia—A Nation Wronged*, published in February 1982 by representatives of the British Council of Churches who had visited the Territory in November 1981, confirmed that South African forces stationed in northern Namibia were terrorizing the local population. The report, *inter alia*, referred to a practice commonly resorted to by the South African security forces: tying the bodies of the alleged terrorists they had killed behind their vehicles and dragging them through the villages. The bodies are exhibited to the parents of the dead, to villagers and even to young children in schools. The organizers of such gruesome spectacles, however, get away scot-free since, under the law, civil servants, members of the police and the army are indemnified against any action taken in "good faith" in the operational area.

229. Discriminatory laws and practices also govern education, housing, health, employment and all other aspects of the daily life of the Namibians. According to a 1982 study of the Africa Fund in New York, the life expectancy for Namibian whites is from 68 to 72 years as compared with between 42 to 52 for the blacks. Similarly, the infant

mortality rate is 145 per thousand for the blacks, compared to 21.6 for the whites. It was also said that of 152 doctors in Namibia 80 per cent practised in the urban areas, where the majority of the whites live, compared to the only 20 per cent who practised in the rural areas, where half of the total population lives.

230. At the hearings on Namibian uranium conducted by the United Nations Council for Namibia from 7 to 11 July 1980[3] and published recently, experts from the United States, the United Kingdom and France described the dangerous effects on health and environment of the mining and processing of uranium. Great concern was expressed over the unusually limited and racially discriminatory health care given at the Rössing mine. Enormous piles of ground-up ore, called "tailings", which are dangerously radioactive, are being left unattended. This, the report cautions, could remain a threat to the environment for 100,000 years.

231. In addressing ourselves to the question under consideration my delegation would like to underscore one fundamental premise—that independence in Namibia can and must be achieved in accordance with the principles embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations, particularly resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). The heart of the Namibian problem is, as we all know, remarkable in its simplicity: a people deprived of its right to national independence and self-determination, a Territory occupied by brutal military force. Far from abiding by international opinion as expressed in numerous United Nations resolutions, South Africa has progressively undertaken steps designed to destroy the territorial integrity of Namibia. It has occupied Walvis Bay, which is an integral part of Namibia. The logical extension of this policy has been the systematic fragmentation of the Territory along ethnic and racial lines exemplified by the system of bantustanization. The holding of mock elections leading to the formation of a so-called National Assembly has been declared null and void by the Council [*resolution 439 (1978)*]. The racist régime has massively deployed its armed forces to police the Territory and rule the people through terror and repression. These troops not only are attempting to suppress the struggle for liberation but have also extended their acts of aggression into the neighbouring countries, thereby threatening international peace and security.

232. Bangladesh is proud of its association with Namibia. We deeply value the trust and confidence reposed in us in assisting and facilitating the work of the United Nations Special Representative in the context of UNTAG. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Bangladesh has concerted its actions with like-minded countries to promote the cause of Namibia, particularly in connection with the exploration and exploitation of its natural resources, both onshore and offshore. Within our modest means, we have contributed to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, as well as offered training facilities in Bangladesh to students from Namibia.

233. In the face of unbelievable intransigence and unprovoked aggression, our African brothers have shown commendable restraint and statesmanship. We salute the leadership of SWAPO—the sole authentic and legitimate representative of the Namibian people—for its readiness to sign a cease-fire agreement and for accepting a target date for the arrival of UNTAG, which would set in motion the electoral process under United Nations supervision. Further evidence of the readiness of SWAPO to co-operate in all serious efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement has been provided by its President, Sam Nujoma, during the present session. We welcome his far-sighted acceptance of the need to protect the white minority and its property in an independent Namibia and his agreement to consider the proposal containing principles for the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution of an independent Namibia. We should like to congratulate the leaders of the front-line States—Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Nigeria, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe—on the courage and fortitude they have shown and the invaluable support they have extended to the cause of Namibia. In this hour of trial, we renew our pledge to stand by them.

234. The international community can no longer remain indifferent to all the inhuman crimes being perpetrated by the Government of South Africa. Nor can we remain mute spectators of the endless travail and trauma suffered by the Namibian people. In the name of that same people, whose rights have been trodden under foot and whose land has been laid waste, the perpetrators and usurpers must be called to account by the international community. We should like to reiterate once again that Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) constitute the only viable basis for a peaceful transition of the Territory from colonial subjugation to independence. We seek nothing more than the complete, unconditional and expeditious implementation of these two resolutions.

235. We are sitting atop a rumbling volcano of resentment, frustration and anger that is reaching boiling point—not only in Africa, but around the world, wherever freedom is considered a non-negotiable and inviolable objective. The failure of the United Nations in the past to act firmly and decisively has only encouraged the racist Pretoria régime to intensify its aggression and barbarity. In the present circumstances, it is imperative that this body proceed urgently, with all the authority at its command and all the resources at its disposal, to secure the speedy implementation of its own resolutions.

236. My delegation sincerely hopes and believes that the Council will take effective and concrete measures to bring about the dawn of Namibian independence as envisaged in the United Nations plan approved in Council resolution 435 (1978), which must remain the only basis, without the introduction of extraneous and irrelevant issues, for the final and lasting settlement of the Namibian problem.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1976), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[3] *Plunder of Namibian Uranium: Major Findings of the Hearings on Namibian Uranium held by the United Nations Council for Namibia in July 1980*, DP/715 (United Nations, New York, 1981).

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—March 1991—2,050